

REMARKS

This paper is being submitted in response to the Office Action mailed in the application on October 1. Claims 1- 16 are pending. Claims 1-16 are rejected. Claims 9-16 are indicated as allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome rejections under 35 USC 112, 2nd Paragraph.

Claims 1-8 are canceled herein without prejudice against the filing of an eventual continuation or divisional application. Claims 9 and 11 are currently amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claims 9-16 in view of the preceding amendment and following remarks.

I. 112 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-16 are rejected as being indefinite with regard to

- (claim 1) the terms “the radial outermost edge”, “the radial inside surface” and “the corresponding arcuate segments”, and the term “its” located before central aperture.
- (claim 5) “the upper, outer peripheral edges”.
- (claim 8) “the peripheral edges” and the term “thereof”. (The Action refers to claim 6, but it appears that claim 8 is meant.)
- (claim 9) “the radial outermost edge” and the term “its” or “it”.

Claims 9 (and also 11) have been amended to remove the indefiniteness and provide proper antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 112 rejections of claims 9-16. The rejections of claims 1-8 are moot in view of their cancellation without prejudice against the filing of an eventual continuation or divisional application.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ryford Unlimited (GB 2,243,145). The rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claims 1 and 2 without prejudice toward the filing of an eventual continuation or divisional application.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Huber (US 2002/0112976). Claims 6 and 7 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ryford as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Iandoli et al (US 2003/0019771). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryford and further in view of Sankey et al (US 6,540,074). These rejections are moot in view of the cancellation of these claims without prejudice toward the filing of an eventual continuation or divisional application.

IV. ALLOWABLE CLAIMS

Applicant thanks Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 9-16 if rewritten or amended to overcome the 112 rejections described above. Applicant has amended claims 9 and 11 to overcome the 112 rejections, and has added the limitations of claim 1 into claim 9 so that claim 9 is now in independent form. Applicant submits that claims 9-16 are now allowable.

CONCLUSION

Claims 9-16 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues exist which might be resolved by a telephone conference, they are respectfully invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or underpayments of fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, or to credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account Number 13-2500. Applicant is a large entity.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Donald G. Bauer/

Donald G. Bauer
Registration No. 58,740
Agent for Applicant
(301) 498-3269

MeadWestvaco Corporation, Inc.
Law Department
1021 Main Campus Drive
Centennial Campus
Raleigh, NC 27606
E-mail: docketadministrator@mwv.com
Telephone: (301) 498-3269
Facsimile: (919) 834-0844
Customer No.: 66061